APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,755	10/30/2003	Hideaki Nobusawa	17160	8759

23389   7590   06/22/2010
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER
PEREZ, JULIO R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 March 2010*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *16-40* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *16-40* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 03/23/2010 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Regarding the argument that Stenman does not teach a group of remote control

codes for only one predetermined controlling operation (see page 15 of response). The

examiner respectfully disagrees. Stenman describes in column 7, lines 49-65,

commands via the user interface 2050 of the mobile station, also refer to Figure 4, #'s

2050, 2060, and 2025, which commands associate DTMF keys, i.e., codes, selected,

also interpreted as a group or selection of, or batch (set of codes).The applicant further

argues that Shim does not cure the deficiency of Stenman. That is, transmission means

for transmitting to the target equipment the group of remote control codes as a batch for

the only one operation to be performed (see pages 15-16 or response). The examiner

respectfully disagrees. The "one predetermined controlling operation" limitation is not

narrowed to exclude reasonably broad interpretation that can constitute both a single or

multiple instructions to be transmitted to a targeted piece of equipment as a user's

selected "operation." Thus, the examiner sustains that the reference cited encompasses

transmitting means for initiating a single or multiple instruction data sets, thus,

concluding that the disputed limitation reads on Shim disclosure for user's initiated

transmission of plural data.

Regarding the argument that August does not cure the deficiencies of Stenman

and/or Shim (see page 16 of response). For the reasons indicated previously, the

examiner is not persuaded. Furthermore, it should be noted that Stenman has not been

applied alone to meet the argued limitation. It is the combination of Stenman, Shim, and

August what meets the argued limitations.

Regarding the argument that Wall does not cure the deficiencies of Stenman and

Shim (see pages 16-17 of response). For the reasons indicated previously, the

examiner is not persuaded. The examiner sustains the obviousness rejection of claims

16, 19, 22, 26, 29, 32, 36-38.Thus, the previous rejection is maintained.

Regarding the argument that Wall does not cure the deficiencies in Stenman and

Shim (see page 17 of response). For the reasons indicated previously, the examiner is

not persuaded. The examiner sustains the obviousness rejection of claims 39 and 40.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 16,19, 22,26, 29,32,36, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Stenman et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,029) in view of Shim

(U.S. Patent No. 6,078,270).

Regarding claim 16, Stenman et al. teaches a mobile telephone with remote-

controlling capability which remote-controls target equipment (Col. 3, Lines 22-29 and

Col. 7, Lines 56-63) comprising:

storage means for storing a group of remote control codes for only one predetermined controlling operation to be performed on the target equipment (col. 3, lines 30-33; col. 7, lines 56-63, mobile station with control commands to which a device is responsive);

and transmission means for transmitting to the target equipment remote control codes as a batch for only one predetermined controlling operation on the target equipment in response to a user operation (col. 7, Lines 49-65, describe the user able to command the target device with control of touch screen, i.e., a controlling operation to control the piece of equipment).

Although Stenman teaches remotely controlling such devices as TV/VCR (Col. 7, Lines 15-21), Stenman does not specifically teach transmitting a group of remote control codes stored in the storage means in response to a user operation. Shim, however, teaches transmitting a group of remote control codes stored in the storage means in response to a user operation (Col. 1, Lines 32-58).

Stenman and Shim are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in providing control of other devices. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Stenman with the teaching of Shim of transmitting a group of remote control codes stored in the storage means in response to a user operation to provide a more user friendly remote controlling of devices (Col. 1, Lines 32-58).

Regarding claims 19, Stenman teaches a mobile telephone with remote-controlling capability which remote-controls target equipment, comprising:

an operation unit having a plurality of operation buttons (Col. 3, Lines 22-29 and

Col. 7, Lines 56-63, mobile station with control commands to which a device is

responsive);

storage means for storing various remote control codes associated with the

plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship for various controlling

operations on the target equipment (Col. 3, Lines 30-33 and Col. 7, Lines 56-63,

describes the user able to command the target device with control of touch screen, i.e.,

a controlling operation to control the piece of equipment), and a part of remote control

codes of a group of remote control codes for a predetermined controlling operation on

the target equipment (Col. 3, Lines 30-33);

and transmission means for transmitting to the target equipment the remote

control code (Col. 7, Lines 49-51, describes the user able to command the target device

with control of touch screen, i.e., a controlling operation to control the piece of

equipment) associated with an operation button pressed by a user in advance and the

remote control code to perform the predetermined controlling operation on the target

equipment in response to a user operation (Col. 3, Lines 30-33 and Col. 7, Lines 56-63,

user commands the remote device).

Although Stenman teaches remotely controlling such devices as TV/VCR (Col. 7,

Lines 15-21), Stenman does not specifically teach a code definition unit with code

numbers and using a group of remote control codes formed by a remote control code

associated with an operation button pressed by a user in advance and the part of

remote control codes to perform the predetermined controlling operation on the target

equipment in response to a user operation. Shim, however, teaches a group of remote

control codes formed by a remote control code associated with an operation button

pressed by a user in advance and the part of remote control codes to perform the

predetermined controlling operation on the target equipment in response to a user

operation (Col. 1, Lines 32-58).

Stenman and Shim are analogous art because they are from a similar field of

endeavor in providing control of other devices. Thus, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the

teachings of Stenman with the teaching of Shim of a group of remote control codes

formed by a remote control code associated with an operation button pressed by a user

in advance and the part of remote control codes to perform the predetermined

controlling operation on the target equipment in response to a user operation to provide

a more user friendly remote control (col. 1, lines 32-58).

Regarding claims 22, 32 and 38, Stenman et al. teaches a mobile telephone with

remote-controlling capability which remote-controls target equipment (Col. 3, Lines 22-

29 and Col. 7, Lines 56-63), comprising:

an operation unit having a plurality of operation buttons (Col. 7, Lines 56-63);

storage means for storing various remote control codes associated with the plurality of

operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship for various controlling operations on the

target equipment (Col. 3, Lines 30-33 and Col. 7, Lines 56- 63);

and transmission means for transmitting to the target equipment a remote control

code associated with one button of the plurality of operation buttons (Col. 7, Lines 49-

51) when the one button is pressed and when the mobile telephone is set in a first

remote control mode (Col. 3, Lines 30-33 and Col. 7, Lines 56-63).

Although Stenman teaches remotely controlling such devices as TV/VCR (Col. 7,

Lines 15-21), Stenman does not specifically teach a code definition unit and a first

group of remote control codes for a predetermined first controlling operations on the

target equipment, and a part of a remote control codes of a second group of remote

control codes for a predetermined second controlling operation on the target equipment;

and transmitting to the target equipment the first group of remote control codes in

response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set in a second remote

control mode, and transmitting to the target equipment the second group of remote

control codes pressed by a user in advance and the part of remote control codes in

response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set in a third remote control

mode. Shim, however, teaches teach a first group of remote control codes for a

predetermined first controlling operations on the target equipment (Col. 1, Lines 32-58),

and a part of a remote control codes of a second group of remote control codes for a

predetermined second controlling operation on the target equipment (Col. 3, Lines 58-

60 and Col. 4, Lines 35-42); and transmitting to the target equipment the first group of

remote control codes in response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set

in a second remote control mode (Col. 3, Lines 32-58), and transmitting to the target

equipment the second group of remote control codes pressed by a user in advance and

the part of remote control codes in response to a user operation when the mobile

telephone is set in a third remote control mode (Col. 3, Lines 58-60 and Col. 4, Lines 35-42).

Stenman and Shim are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in providing control of other devices. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Stenman with the teaching of Shim of a first group of remote control codes for a predetermined first controlling operations on the target equipment, and a part of a remote control codes of a second group of remote control codes for a predetermined second controlling operation on the target equipment; and transmitting to the target equipment the first group of remote control codes in response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set in a second remote control mode, and transmitting to the target equipment the second group of remote control codes pressed by a user in advance and the part of remote control codes in response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set in a third remote control mode to provide a more user friendly remote control (Col. 1, Lines 32-58).

Regarding claims 26 and 36, Stenman et al. teaches a mobile telephone with remote-controlling capability which remote-controls target equipment (Col. 3, Lines 22-29 and Col. 7, Lines 56-63) comprising:

storage means for storing a group of remote control codes for only one predetermined controlling operation to be performed on the target equipment (col. 3, lines 30-33; col. 7, lines 56-63, mobile station with control commands to which a device is responsive);

and transmission means for transmitting to the target equipment remote control

codes for only one predetermined controlling operation on the target equipment in

response to a user operation (col. 7, Lines 49-65, describe the user able to command

the target device with control of touch screen, i.e., a controlling operation to control the

piece of equipment).

Although Stenman teaches remotely controlling such devices as TV/VCR (Col. 7,

Lines 15-21), Stenman does not specifically teach transmitting a group of remote

control codes stored in the storage means in response to a user operation. Shim,

however, teaches transmitting a group of remote control codes stored in the storage

means in response to a user operation (Col. 1, Lines 32-58).

Stenman and Shim are analogous art because they are from a similar field of

endeavor in providing control of other devices. Thus, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the

teachings of Stenman with the teaching of Shim of transmitting a group of remote

control codes stored in the storage means in response to a user operation to provide a

more user friendly remote controlling of devices (Col. 1, Lines 32-58).

Regarding claims 29 and 37, Stenman et al. teaches a remote-controlling method

for a mobile telephone with remote-controlling capability which remote-controls target

equipment (Col. 3, Lines 22-29 and Col. 7, Lines 56-63), and has an operation unit and

storage means for storing various remote control codes associated with a plurality of

operation buttons of the operation unit in a one-to-one relationship for various

controlling operations on the target equipment (Col. 3, Lines 30-33 and Col. 7, Lines 56-

63), and a part of remote control codes of a group of remote control codes for a

predetermined controlling operation on the target equipment (Col. 3, Lines 29-33),

comprising:

a step of transmitting to the target equipment a remote control code formed by

the part of remote control codes stored in the storage means (Col. 7, Lines 49-51) and a

remote control code associated with an operation button pressed by a user in advance

to perform the predetermined controlling operation on the target equipment in response

to a user operation (Col. 7, Lines 56-63).

Although Stenman teaches remotely controlling such devices as TV/VCR (Col. 7,

Lines 15-21), Stenman does not teach using a group of remote control codes formed

by the part of remote control codes stored in the storage means. Shim teaches using a

group of remote control codes formed by the part of remote control codes stored in the

storage means (Col. 1, Lines 32-58). Shim, however, teaches using a group of remote

control codes formed by the part of remote control codes stored in the storage means

(Col. 1, Lines 32-58).

Stenman and Shim are analogous art because they are from a similar field of

endeavor in providing control of other devices. Thus, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the

teachings of Stenman with the teaching of Shim using a group of remote control codes

formed by the part of remote control codes stored in the storage means to provide a

more user friendly remote control (Col. 1, Lines 32-58).

4.   Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Stenman in view of Shim and further in view of August et al (U.S. Patent No.
5,671,267).

Regarding claim 17, Stenman further teaches wherein the target equipment is a
video recording device (Col. 7, Lines 16-18), but does not teach the group of remote
control codes forms recording information for recording of a program.

August teaches the group of remote control codes forms recording information
for recording of a program (Col. 8, Lines 29-33). Thus, at the time the invention was
made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the
teaching of Stenman and Shim with the teachings of August wherein the group of
remote control codes forms recording information for recording of a program in order to
provide remote control and wireless communications in a single device (Col. 1, Lines
29-33).

5.   Claims 18,21, 25, 28, 31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Stenman in view of Shim and further in view of Wall et al. (U.S.
Patent Publication No. 2003/0156053).

Regarding claims 18, 21, Stenman and Shim teach the limitations of claims
16/19, but do not teach downloading the various remote control codes associated with
the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship from a server, which is
connected to a communications network, and has the various remote control codes
associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship, through

the communications network, and storing the various remote control codes in said

storage means.

Wall et al teaches downloading the various remote control codes associated with

the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship from a server (par.20),

which is connected to a communications network (par. 20), and has the various remote

control codes associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one

relationship (Figure 1, pars. 20-23), through the communications network (par. 20), and

storing the various remote control codes in said storage means (par. 23).

Thus, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the art of Stenman et al and Shim with the

teaching of Wall et al of downloading the various remote control codes associated with

the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship from a server, which is

connected to a communications network, and has the various remote control codes

associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship, through

the communications network, and storing the various remote control codes in said

storage means so that the remote control device can receive programming via the

manufacturers web site (par. 20).

Regarding claim 25, Stenman et al. and Shim teach the limitations of claim 25,

but do not teach wherein each remote control code stored in said storage means is

received from a server connected to a communications network through the

communications network. Wall et al teaches each remote control code stored in said

storage means is received from a server connected to a communications network

through the communications network (0020, 0023 and Figure 1).

Thus, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Stenman et al. and Shim

with the teaching of Wall et al wherein each remote control code stored in said storage

means is received from a server connected to a communications network through the

communications network so that the remote control device can receive programming via

the manufacturers web site (par. 20).

6.   Claim 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Stenman et al. and Shim and further in view of Wall et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No.

2003/0156053).

Regarding claim 28, Stenman and Shim teach the limitations of claims 22/26, but

do not teach downloading the various remote control codes associated with the plurality

of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship from a server, which is connected to a

communications network, and has the various remote control codes associated with the

plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship, through the communications

network, and storing the various remote control codes in said storage means.

7.   Claims 31, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Stenman et al. and Shim and further in view of Wall et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No.

2003/0156053).

Regarding claims 31, 35, Stenman and Shim teach the limitations of claims 29,

32, but do not teach downloading the various remote control codes associated with the

plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship from a server, which is connected to a communications network, and has the various remote control codes associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship, through the communications network, and storing the various remote control codes in said storage means.

Wall et al teaches downloading the various remote control codes associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship from a server (par.20), which is connected to a communications network (par. 20), and has the various remote control codes associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship (Figure 1, pars. 20-23), through the communications network (par. 20), and storing the various remote control codes in said storage means (par. 23).

Thus, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the art of Stenman and Shim with the teachings of Wall et al of downloading the various remote control codes associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship from a server, which is connected to a communications network, and has the various remote control codes associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship, through the communications network, and storing the various remote control codes in said storage means so that the remote control device can receive programming via the manufacturers web site (par. 20).

8.   Claims 20,23,24,27,30,33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Stenman et al. and Shim and further in view of August et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 5,671,267).

Regarding claims 23, 27 and 33, Stenman et al. further teaches wherein the

target equipment is a video recording device (Col. 7, Lines 16-18), but does not teach

the group of remote control codes forms recording information for recording of a

program.

August teaches the group of remote control codes forms recording information

for recording of a program (Col. 8, Lines 29-33).

Thus, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Stenman et al. and Shim

with the teaching of August et al. wherein the group of remote control codes forms

recording information for recording of a program to provide remote control and wireless

communications in a single device (Col. 1, Lines 29-33) .

Regarding claims 20, 24, Stenman et al. and Shim teach the limitations of claims

20, 24, but do not teach wherein the group of remote control codes forms time setting

information for setting a time on the target equipment. August teaches wherein the

group of remote control codes forms time setting information for setting a time on the

target equipment. (Col. 8, Lines 29-33).

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Stenman and Shim with the

teachings of August wherein the group of remote control codes forms time setting

information for setting a time on the target equipment to provide remote control and

wireless communications in a single device (Col. 1, Lines 29-33).

Regarding claims 30 and 34, Stenman et al. and Shim teach the limitations of

claims 30 and 34, but do not teach wherein the group of remote control codes forms

time setting information for setting a time on the target equipment. August teaches

wherein the group of remote control codes forms time setting information for setting a

time on the target equipment. (Col. 8, Lines 29-33).

Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Stenman and Shim with the

teachings of August wherein the group of remote control codes forms time setting

information for setting a time on the target equipment to provide remote control and

wireless communications in a single device (Col. 1, Lines 29-33).

9.   Claims 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Stenman in view of Shim in view of Wall et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No.

2003/0156053).

Regarding claim 39, Stenman et al. teaches a remote control system,

comprising:

a mobile telephone with remote-controlling capability which has an operation unit

provided with a plurality of operation buttons, and remote-controls target equipment

(Col. 3, Lines 22-29); wherein said mobile telephone comprises:

storage means (Col. 3, Lines 30-33 and Col. 7, Lines 56-63);

and transmission means for transmitting to the target equipment a remote control code associated with one button of the plurality of operation buttons when the one button is pressed and when the mobile telephone is set in a first remote control mode (Col. 7, Lines 49-51),

but does not teach a first group of remote control codes for a predetermined first controlling operations on the target equipment, and a part of a remote control codes of a second group of remote control codes for a predetermined second controlling operation on the target equipment; and transmitting to the target equipment the first group of remote control codes in response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set in a second remote control mode, and transmitting to the target equipment the second group of remote control codes pressed by a user in advance and the part of remote control codes in response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set in a third remote control mode.

Shim, however, teaches teach a first group of remote control codes for a predetermined first controlling operations on the target equipment (Col. 1, Lines 32-58), and a part of a remote control codes of a second group of remote control codes for a predetermined second controlling operation on the target equipment (Col. 3, Lines 58-60 and Col. 4, Lines 35-42);

and transmitting to the target equipment the first group of remote control codes in response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set in a second remote control mode (Col. 3, Lines 32-58), and transmitting to the target equipment the second group of remote control codes pressed by a user in advance and the part of remote

control codes in response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set in a third remote control mode (Col. 3, Lines 58-60 and Col. 4, Lines 35-42).

Thus, at the time the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Stenman with the teachings of Shim of a first group of remote control codes for a predetermined first controlling operations on the target equipment, and a part of a remote control codes of a second group of remote control codes for a predetermined second controlling operation on the target equipment Col. 1, Lines 32-58);

and transmitting to the target equipment the first group of remote control codes in response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set in a second remote control mode, and transmitting to the target equipment the second group of remote control codes pressed by a user in advance and the part of remote control codes in response to a user operation when the mobile telephone is set in a third remote control mode to provide a more user friendly remote control (Col. 1, Lines 32-58).

Stenman and Shim teach the limitations of claim 39, but do not teach a server which is connected to a communications network, and stores various remote control codes associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship for various controlling operations on the target equipment, download means for downloading the various remote control codes, the first group of remote control codes, and the part of remote control codes from said server through the communications network, and storing the downloaded codes in said storage means.

Wall, however, teaches a server which is connected to a communications network (par. 20), and stores various remote control codes associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship for various controlling operations on the target equipment (par. 20 and par. 23), download means for downloading the various remote control codes (par. 20), the first group of remote control codes, and the part of remote control codes from said server through the communications network (par. 20), and storing the downloaded codes in said storage means (0023).

Thus, at the time the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Stenman and Shim with the teachings of Wall with a server, taught by Wall, which is connected to a communications network, and stores various remote control codes associated with the plurality of operation buttons in a one-to-one relationship for various controlling operations on the target equipment, download means for downloading the various remote control codes, the first group of remote control codes, and the part of remote control codes from said server through the communications network, and storing the downloaded codes in said storage means so that the remote control device can receive programming via the manufacturers web site (par. 20).

Regarding claim 40, the combination discloses claim 39, various control codes associate with plurality of operation buttons to be used to control different operations (Stenman, Col. 3, Lines 30-33 and Col. 7, Lines 56-63).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JULIO PEREZ whose telephone number is (571)272-

7846. The examiner can normally be reached on 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, PATRICK EDOUARD can be reached on (571)272-7603. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

6/17/2010   /J. P./
                                                               Examiner, Art Unit 2617
/Patrick N. Edouard/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617